



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ART. X.—*On the original extension of the Sanskrit language over certain portions of Asia and Europe; and on the ancient Aryans (आर्य), Indians, or Hindus of India-Propri.* By A. CURZON, Esq.

IN tracing back the origin of nations beyond the period embraced by the special histories of Greece and Rome, we reach the interval in universal history, during which four great nations are known to have flourished, and to have extended their relations, political, military, or commercial, over the various regions of the globe. These are the races of India, China, Phœnicia, and Egypt. The two latter have long ceased to exist as distinct nations; or rather have been absorbed in other nationalities; whilst the two former, beside constituting the most numerous portion of the human race, have continued their ethnical existence to the present time. That other races of men inhabited the countries which have since been occupied and peopled by these races anterior to them may be considered certain; but no data exist from which it can be inferred that any considerable monarchy, or empire, was ever founded in any of these countries, prior to the clear, national establishment of those races, respectively, in India, China, Phœnicia, and Egypt. The three former are the nations of Asia, who, whether by the antiquity of the civilization attributed to them, or the permanent influence they have exerted in the history of mankind, must be regarded by modern writers as the earliest races that have established themselves as great nations, whose peculiar languages and institutions mark them as the most distinct divisions of the human species, from whose records all researches in general history and ethnology must commence. Of the Chinese and the Phœnicians I shall have as little to remark as of the Egyptians. It is principally to the race of India, branched out and multiplied into that of the great Indo-European family, that the few observations I beg to offer in this brief and imperfect paper will be directed.¹

¹ In speaking of this race, it has been usual to employ the term Indo-Germanic; but this appears too restricted in signification. Although the classification of the various nations who belong to this family would admit of almost unlimited subdivision, the more important only can be here noticed. I should therefore prefer to divide this great family into the Indo-Persic, Indo-Scythic, Indo-Hellenic, Indo-Italic, Indo-Celtic, Indo-Gothic, Indo-Slavonic, and Indo-Polynesian nations. These, it will be observed, are only the principal groups of the family. It would

From the study of the Sanskrit language, and the researches which have been made into its literature, within little more than half a century, by the labours of Jones, Wilford, Colebrooke, Professor Wilson, and more recently by the philological investigations of Bopp, Burnouf, Pott, Lassen, and Benfey, amongst other inquirers, a fact of a very high historical importance may be considered to have been established, and to be now fully recognised by all acquainted with the languages classed as those of the Indo-European family; namely, that there is a remarkable analogy in their structure and grammatical forms, and a surprising similarity—resulting in ultimate identity—in the radical words comprehended in all the members of this family of languages. These are the Sanskrit, Cuneiform, Persian, (Zandic)¹, Armenian, Greek, Latin,

transcend the limits of this sketch to offer any remarks on the ethnological systems of Blumenbach, Prichard, or other naturalists. If races of men be conveniently classed, however, according to their primitive settlements along certain mountain ranges, as the original seat of the Turkish nations is supposed to be the Altai range, and of the Finns the Ural chain of mountains, the Aryans would be more appropriately designated, perhaps, as the *Himalayan* race than as constituting the Caucasian.

¹ With respect to the language which was first introduced to the European world by Anquetil du Perron as “Zende,” and which has since continued under that designation, I cannot refrain from observing that the true import of this term appears to have been strangely misunderstood. What does the word “Zand” mean? I am not aware that either Olshausen, Lassen, or Bopp has given any explanation of the signification of this word. Brockhaus, a more recent authority, supposes it, adopting Burnouf’s views, to be derived from “Zaŋtu,” used in the *Yasna* in the sense of “ville,” “bourg.” He observes, “Aus diesem Worte, in dem Sinne des Städtischen, Gebildeten, bildet sich die Bedeutung: gebildete Sprache der Städte, darin geschriebenes Buch. Hieraus der Name Zend zu erklären.” (Vendidad Sade, 1850, p. 360.) Instead of elucidating the meaning, however, it is evident that the word has no connexion whatever with “zaŋtu,” the

Zandic form of the Sans. जन्तु (jantu), which is derived from another root जन (jan) “to be born or produced.” Zand, in زندهاوستا (zand-avastá), or زندهابستا (zand-abastá),—for it is written either way in Persian,—was never applied by the Parsis to the ancient *language* of Persia, but to the *books* of Zoroaster, and is consequently improperly used to designate that dialect of Sanskrit. This word is certainly derived from one or other of the following

Sanskrit bases:—कण्डस (chhandas), as suggested by W. von Schlegel, in the sense of the Vedas, that is, scripture; खण्ड (khanda), काण्ड (kānda), or स्कन्ध (skandha), meaning section, or chapter of a book, or book itself. It is sometimes written ژند (zhand), which, if considered as the more ancient orthography, is easily traced to कण्ड (chhanda), with the original sibilant

Celtic, Gothic, German, Lithuanian, Slavonic, and numerous other kindred forms of speech. With the exception of the four first, they comprise, with their dialects and sub-dialects, nearly the whole of the languages of the different nations of ancient and modern Europe. It is known that from each of these a variety of vernacular dialects has sprung up, some of which have become dead languages, and have given rise to other newer idioms. Thus from the Sanskrit are usually enumerated fifty-six dialects as known in India; the principal of which are the Páli, long since the dead and sacred tongue of the Buddhists; the Mágadhi, a more recent form of Páli, and an ancient dialect of a great part of Behár, also a dead language; various forms of Prákrit; besides nine-tenths of Hindi, Bengali, Mahratti, Gujrati, and the rest of the fifty-six dialects. Páli, in its turn, forms a considerable part of

dropped. It appears to have been formerly employed by the Parsis, nearly in the same manner as the Páli **खाण्ड** (khánda), in **धम्मखाण्ड** (dhamma-khánda), "book of religion," for the Sanskrit **धर्मखाण्ड** (dharmakhaṇḍa), which is applied by the Buddhists of Burmah to their scriptures.

Erskine, Rask, and Lepsius were of opinion long since that the Zand writing was only a transcript of the Pehlavi (since verified by Olshausen—see Thomas, in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, xii. 255-6), and is therefore not older than the time of the Sassanides (compare Lepsius, *Ueber die Anordnung und Verwandtschaft des Semitischen, Indischen, etc.*, p. 56).

Viewing this language in the most unexceptionable form, according as it is presented in the restorations of Burnouf, in the *Commentaire sur le Yaçna*, and continued in a series of papers in the *Journal Asiatique*, and according also to a more recent emended edition of the *Zand-Avastá*, by Professor Lassen (*Vendidadi capita quinque priora*, Bonn, 1852), its character as a dialect of Sanskrit, though strangely transformed in a Pehlavi dress, cannot stand in comparison with the Cuneiform Persian in point of antiquity. Spiegel, the latest investigator into the real structure and character of this language, finds the term "zand" so indefinite and vague as to call the language the "Pársisprache" (see his *Grammatik der Pársisprache nebst Sprachproben*, Leipzig, 1851), although the language of the Parsis, properly so called, is the Gujrati in India, and modern Persian in Persia. With reference to the true etymological signification of **ابستا** (abastá), which is lost in Persian, Müller (*Essai sur le Pehlavi*, p. 297) and Spiegel (in the above Grammar, pp. 206, 207) consider, from the manner in which it is employed by the Parsis, that it corresponds to the European acceptance of "textus." This is true in its modern and conventional sense; but this view gives no explanation of its probable derivation. The word, I conceive, is only a modified form of the Sanskrit **अभ्यस्त** (abhyasta), "learned by heart," or "committed to memory as a sacred precept," and seems to explain its connexion with **زند** (zhaud), or **छन्द** (chhanda), the scriptures of Zaratusht.

the languages of Burmah, Pegu, Siam, and other Buddhistic countries. From the Persic have sprung at least twelve dialects, including the Pehlavi and the Dari. The ancient grammatical Armenian, to which the Phrygian was nearly related, appears to have been connected also with the Median and the Lydian. Independently of the four classical dialects, the Æolic, Doric, Ionic, and Attic, there must have prevailed contemporaneously with these the Thessalian, Bœotian, Elean, Macedonian, and other dialects, among the different Greek states, less cultivated, of course, than the four former. The Thracian, however it may have been regarded by Athenian vanity, must be considered as allied to the Greek, though more remotely than the Macedonian, and stood between the latter and the Gothic. The Doric was closely connected with the Macedonian, which is natural, considering the supposed original seat of the Dorians; the Macedonian with the Thracian, the Thracian with the Phrygian, the Phrygian with the Armenian, the Armenian with the Persic, and the Persic with the Sanskrit.

Of the various dialects of ancient Italy, which, after the Roman dominion, merged into and formed the common language of the Romans, the Etruscan and the Oscan seem to have exerted the greatest influence. The Umbrian dialect was almost obsolete on the spread of the Etruscan. We have no certain knowledge of the characteristic discrepancies or peculiarities of the other dialects, excepting the Doric tendency of those of the south, which are more Hellenic than Italic. The whole of the pre-roman Italic dialects differed no more from each other and from their parent type than did the numerous Prakrit forms of the same in India at a synchronous period; otherwise the classical Latin, which is only the cultivated, condensed, modified, and written form of those dialects, would present a physiognomy more distinct and varying from the Sanskrit than the likeness which it is known to bear to the latter. The principal derivatives of Latin are, it is almost superfluous to observe, the four cultivated languages of modern Europe, as exhibited in the Italian, French, Spanish, and Portuguese, throughout the various phases which they have assumed for the last ten or twelve centuries. In addition to which may be named the Romanic, or obsolete language of the troubadours, and the mixed Neo-Hellenic and Slavonic, and very considerably modified languages of the Bulgarians and Wallachians.¹

The Gothic is the most ancient language of the division of which

For further particulars on the remains of the ancient Italic languages, see Aufrecht and Kirchhoff, in *Die Umbrischen Sprachdenkmäler*, and the *Oskische Grammatik* of the former author.

it is at the head. To this belong the Anglo-Saxon, the Friesic, and other allied dialects. The old High German of the eighth century, the middle old High German, and the modern form, with the Dutch and English, or more correctly, the Anglo-Saxon portion of the latter, subdivisions from the Gothic branch. From the Lithuanian, except in a few particulars, the old Slavonic differs little, with which the Russian, Polish, Bohemian, Servian, Croatian, and other less known cognate idioms, are connected. Of the old Northorn, or Scandinavian (the language of the Eddas), the Icelandic, the Norwegian, Swedish, and Danish, together with the subdialects of Greenland, the Feroe, Shetland, and Orkney isles, are more modern forms. As there are no means of judging of the Celtic, considered as coeval with the Latin, or even with the Gothic, I can only name the remains of this language in the four forms of the Gaelic, Erse, Welsh, and Bas-breton. The Caucasian members of the same family, which Klaproth¹ had classed as belonging to a different group of languages, are now included in the same, by the more searching investigations of Bopp.

The analogy which the two classical languages of European antiquity bear to the Sanskrit, soon arrested the attention of the first students of Sanskrit, Halhed, Jones, and Wilkins. The connexion has now been found to prevail in other languages, less known and cultivated than the preceding.

The languages of ancient Europe not comprised in this enumeration, which is intended only as a rapid view of the principal members of the Aryan family, are those of the Phœnician colonies of Spain, Portugal, South of France, and perhaps of Britain and Ireland; together with what we must suppose to have constituted the languages of the preceding aboriginal or unclassified inhabitants of Europe, amongst whom the Turduli and Turdetani mentioned by Strabo, though flourishing so late as the first century of the Christian era, are the most remarkable.²

¹ Asia Polyglotta, p. 133.

² Though the passage is rather a digression, as it relates to an interesting people nearly lost to history, it may not be irrelevant to quote. Of these nations, and the country they occupied, the geographer observes:—

καλοῦσι δ' ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ ποταμοῦ Βαιτικὴν· ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἑνοικοῦντων Τουρδετανίαν· τοὺς δ' ἑνοικοῦντας Τουρδετανούς τε καὶ Τουρδούλους προσαγορεύουσιν οἱ μὲν τοὺς αὐτοὺς νομίζουσιν· οἱ δ' ἐτέρως· ὧν ἔστι καὶ Πολυβίος, συνοίκους φήσας τοῖς Τουρδετάνοις πρὸς ἄρκτον τοὺς Τουρδούλους. νυνὶ δ' ἐν αὐτοῖς οὐδεὶς φαίνεται ἑωρισμὸς. Σοφώτατοι δ' ἐξετάζονται τῶν Ἰβηρων οὗτοι, καὶ γραμματικῇ χρῶνται, καὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς μνήμης ἔχουσι τὰ συγγράμματα, καὶ ποιήματα, καὶ νόμους ἡμμέτρους ἐξακισχιλίων ἑτῶν ὥς φάσι.—Geog., lib. III. p. 204; Amstel. 1707.

“It [the territory] is called Boetica from the river, and Turdetania from the

Bopp, followed by other investigators in the field of comparative philology, has assumed the position that the Sanskrit, Zandic, Greek, Latin and even Gothic, are languages of a coeval formation;¹ yet the very basis of his researches rests, as it must necessarily rest, on the recognition of the greater antiquity of the Sanskrit over the other kindred dialects. If it can be shown, however, that any one of the nations who spoke these kindred languages was established as a civilized people anterior to the attainment, by any of the rest, of this early civilization, or indeed before their very existence as distinct nations, apart from an etymological analysis of the structure of these forms of speech, considered on independent grounds, which refers them to one common origin—it follows that the language spoken by that pre-established people must be the most ancient, if not the parent, of those other analogous languages, which are consequently inferred to be derived from that source. I venture to affirm that they have all sprung, at different chronological periods, from the Sanskrit; not the existing language in which the *Rāmáyana*, *Mahá-bhárata*, and the *Puráñas* are written, but the Vaidik Sanskrit, essentially and peculiarly the primitive written tongue of the Aryan race, or ancient Hindus of India-*Proper*. I conceive those languages to have arisen synchronously with the different tribes who have spoken them, and exactly as the latter have appeared in history.

inhabitants, and the inhabitants Turdetani and Turduli. Some consider them as identical and others as distinct nations. Of the latter opinion is Polybius, who says the Turduli are situated to the north of the Turdetani. At present, however, there appears to be no difference between them. They are reckoned the most intelligent of the Iberians, possess a literature, ancient written records, poems, and laws in verse, it is said, of six thousand years' date."

With the scanty notices which exist of what appears to have been a lost civilization, it is difficult to judge in which category of races we ought to place these nations; whether we are to consider them as having relation to the Semitic family, and originally Phœnician colonists in Spain; or as belonging to an unrecognised branch of the Aryan stock, or to some other unknown race.

¹ Comparative Grammar (Translation), from page 1 throughout; and in his work *Ueber die Verwandtschaft der malayisch-polynesischen Sprachen mit den indisch-europäischen*, in pp. 1, 13, 15, 16, 30, etc. He says of the European members of this family of languages, "dem Sanskrit schwesternlich die Hand reichen," not contemplating the possibility of its being shown that the Sanskrit had ceased to be a spoken language several centuries before those dialects were formed, or the historical existence of the nations who spoke them. Without the recognition of the principle of the pre-existence and influence of the Sanskrit as an ancient tongue in determining the true meanings of words in various languages, it would have been impossible for Lassen, Westergaard, and Rawlinson to have successfully interpreted the Cuneiform-Persic inscriptions; or for Burnouf to have attempted to correct and restore the language of the *Vandidád Sádah*. It would have been equally as impossible for Bopp himself to have written his masterly work without, perhaps, unconsciously admitting that principle.

Although it is principally from the nature and structure of the Sanskrit language itself, from its archaic forms combined with the impress of an early cultivation, and from its capability of resolving into intelligible meanings nearly the whole bulk of the radical words contained in the derivative languages of Persia, Greeco, Rome, Central Europe, &c., yet, from the remarkable internal evidence afforded by the primitive religion of the Vedas;¹ from the mythological system of the Purānas, though of a later age than the Vedas, being found to pre-

¹ In reference to the age of the sūktas of the Vedas, after the opinions which have been expressed by Sir William Jones who, in speaking of the Yajur-veda, gives 1500 B.C. (Inst. of Menu, pref., p. 12) as its probable date; and Colebrooke (with whom Poley coincides, Filuf Upan, pref., p. 2), who supposes, from astronomical data, 1400 B.C. as the epoch of their collection into the form of Saṁhitās, thus implying some time antecedent to this date as the period of their general currency in India (Miscellaneous Essays, I. pp. 100, 200, 332), it might seem supererogatory to offer any further observation on the question. With every respect for the opinions of those distinguished men, to whom, with Wilkins and Professor Wilson, the present generation of Orientalists must ever be indebted for opening the path to a new and vast field of philological and historical research, I beg to observe that as the efforts of Lepsius, Bunsen, and other investigators in collecting data from the monuments of Egypt, are tending to establish a more correct system of chronology than now prevails, I consider the above conjectures (for they are only given as such by their authors) far from even approximating to the true epoch of the composition of the sūktas of the Vedas. My impression is grounded on the following considerations.

The dates of the reigns of several kings in the dynasties of Manetho, and other important events in the history of Egypt, have now been fixed on a satisfactory basis. Thus the epoch of the commencement of the eighteenth dynasty is 1600 B.C.; the invasion of the Hyksos, 2200 B.C.; the reign of Amenemha III., of the twelfth dynasty, the builder of the original labyrinth, 2300 B.C.; reformation of the Egyptian calendar, 2782 B.C.; introduction of the solar calendar, 3282 B.C.; epoch of Chepren-Snefru, Cheops-Chufu, and Menkera, of the fourth dynasty, builders of the pyramids of Gizah, between 3430 and 3400 B.C.; and the first year of Menes is "*historically established*" as occurring in 3893 B.C. (Lepsius, *Chronologie der Ägypter*, I. p. 499.) Papyrus was employed by the Egyptians before the year 3400 B.C., as ascertained from monuments of the fourth and fifth dynasties; and hieroglyphical writing was *already in use* in the time of Menes. (Bunsen, in *Ägyptens Stelle in der Weltgeschichte*, I. pp. 33—36.) Osymandyns—that is, Ramesses-Miamun—in the fourteenth century B.C. had an extensive library in his temple at Thebes, which had been collected from the more ancient libraries of his predecessors. (Bunsen, *id.*, p. 39.)

With the existence of these facts, without citing others of a similar nature, drawn from the history of Egypt, I cannot suppose that the Aryans were, at co-eval periods of their history, even viewing them as ethnically unconnected with the Egyptians, in a less advanced state of civilization; or that society could have existed in India without a moral or religious code, which must have been based on the Vedas, long ages anterior to the dates assigned by our Orientalists for the period of their composition.

M. Langlois, the French translator of the Rig-veda, supposes that a portion of

vail in a fragmentary and imperfect state in the earliest myths and legends of Greece, Rome, Central Europe, and Persia ;¹ supported as these facts generally are in the writings of Jones, Wilford, Colebrooke, Bohlson, Benfey, and confirmed by a reference to the scattered notices of India to be found in the numerous classical authorities collected by

them, the sáktas, are co-eval at least with the great pyramids of Egypt. He observes, "composé à une époque immémoriale, c'est le monument littéraire le plus ancien qui ait été conservé, et il nous représente, dans l'histoire de l'esprit humain, une phase inconnue, et d'autant plus intéressante à étudier qu'elle peut nous révéler le point de départ des principales idées qui ont dominé toute l'antiquité classique. Merveilleuse étude à poursuivre, que celle qui se fait sur un livre, contemporain, dans quelques-unes au moins de ses parties, de ces grands monuments d'Egypte dont la pierre est encore silencieusement énigmatique !" (Introduction to the Translation of the Rig-veda, p. 1.) I agree with him and Professor Wilson in the opinion that the hymns of the Rig-veda were composed at successive periods (Id., p. 12), and considerably anterior to the epoch of the first two Rāmās. Whether the four sacred books of the Egyptians are the Vedas themselves, or a modified form of the same, is not as yet ascertained from the monuments of Egypt; but any distinct notice or allusion to them in the monuments would not only confirm the greater antiquity of those works than is admitted, but would enable us then to approximate in some degree to the epoch, or epochs, if not of their composition, at least to that of their first general prevalence and reception in India as the foundation of the religious system of the Aryans.

"The fundamental parts of the Purānas," says Troyer, "are as ancient as the Vedas themselves." (Prelim. Dis. to his translation of the Dabistān, p. 60). Vans Kennedy had made the same observation before. Burnouf says of the Bhāgavata Purāna, the most recent, it is supposed, of the class (and the observation applies to the whole of them), "Il appartient pour le fond comme pour la forme, à un ensemble d'ouvrages dont on ne possède encore que des fragments, dont on ignore l'origine et l'histoire, et dont la langue n'est comprise que d'un petit nombre d'erudits." (Bhāg. Pur., Pref., p. 1.) Again, with respect to their age: "Ils sont également antérieurs, pour la plus grande partie, à la révolution opérée par le Bouddhisme dans l'Inde six siècles au moins avant notre ère." (Id., p. cix.) Independently of being expressly mentioned in Manu, chap. III. sl. 232, and XII. 109 (date according to Sir Wm. Jones, 800—1200 n.c., Inst. of Menu, Pref. p. 11); in the code of Yājñavalkya, the Mitāksharā, line 5; in the Rāmāyana, Ayodhyākanda, chap. XV. sl. 19, p. 351, Schlegel's ed.; in the Mahābhārata, Adiparva I., sl. 17, 23, 2290, etc., the ages of which, according to Lassen and Alexander von Humboldt, considerably precede that of the appearance of Buddha, the latest date assigned to whom is in the sixth century n.c., the Purānas are twice cited as the fifth Veda in the Chhāndogya upanishad of the Sāma-veda; in the Vrihad-āranyaka upanishad of the Yajur-veda, pp. 30, 55, 56, Poley's ed. 1844; in the Mundāka upanishad of the Atharva-veda, p. 117; and, I have no doubt, in other ancient works as yet little known.

From these authorities, corroborated by that of Colebrooke, who says "that the names of itihāsa and purāna are anterior to Vyāsa" (Misc. l. Essays, I. p. 11), and of Professor Wilson, who is of opinion that "a very great portion of the contents of many, some portion of the contents of all, is genuine and old" (Vishnu Pur. Trans., Pref. p. vi), there can be little doubt that the primitive portions of

Schwanbeck (*Megasthenis Indica*, 1846), it may be considered as established, I presume, that long anterior to the foundation of Rome, or the settlement of the Hellenic communities, the Aryan race of India had attained to a high degree of civilization. This is further evinced by the great body of Vaidik literature in the form of *sūktas*, *brāhmaṇas*, *upanishads*, *sūtras*, &c. ; by the codes of Manu, Yājñavalkya, and other legislators ; by the fundamental and most ancient portion of the *Purāṇas* ; by a series of grammarians from a remote period to Pāṇini ; by the great heroic poems of the *Rāmāyana* and the *Mahābhārata* ; by Dhanwantari and his successors in medicine, Āryabhatta in the mathematics and astronomy, Gotama in logic, and, if the means of research were extant, by other names of ancient celebrity.¹

All the existing works in Sanskrit are, in my opinion, but the remains of a literature which, I think, there are good grounds to infer had flourished and declined, though subsequently revived at different epochs, before the period to which I have referred, when a great portion of Europe appears to have been inhabited by rude tribes.

The language of the Aryan race, however, has been found to have spread itself over a succession of extensive regions, from Āryavartta, through Ariana, Persia, Armenia, Phrygia, Macedonia, Greece continental and insular, Italy, the islands of Sardinia and Corsica, Spain, Gaul, Britain, Germany, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Southern and central Russia in Europe, Southern Russia in Asia, portions of central Asia, and in an easterly direction through Burmah to the confines of the Chinese monarchy ; also southward, at a very early period, to the whole extent of the peninsula of India, as well as to the opposite coast of the bay of Bengal, down to the peninsula of Malacca (Lankā, according to Wilford), and the great islands of the Indian Archipelago, as Sumatra, Java, Borneo, and other islands of the Indian and Pacific Oceans. The question now presents itself,—

the *Purāṇas* are next in point of antiquity to the *sūktas* of the *Vedas*, and generally more ancient than the *Brāhmaṇas*, *upanishads*, and *sūtras*, and the two great heroic poems. (Compare Windischmann, in his *Sancara, sive de theologumonis Vedanticorum*, pp. 55—57 ; and Vans Kennedy, *Researches into the nature and affinity of ancient and Hindu Mythology*, pp. 189, 364, 365.)

¹ In the old *Prātisākhya* grammars of the *Vedas*, thirty-six ancient grammarians are mentioned by name, most of whom are alluded to by Pāṇini and Yāska, and are noticed in the *Vṛihad-āranyaka* and *Altareya Upanishads*. (See Rudolph Roth, *Zur Litteratur und Geschichte des Weda*, pp. 65, 66.) Vopadeva, in his list of roots, the *कविकल्पद्रुम* (*kavi-kalpa-druma*), quotes Kandra,

Kāśakṛitsna, Apisali, Śakatyāna, as grammarians who flourished anterior to Pāṇini. (Westergaard, *Radices Sanscritæ*, p. 5.)

How has this phenomenon arisen? How has the Aryan language, of which the **संस्कृत**, Sanskrit, is the most *perfected* form, been disseminated over such vast regions of the globe?

To answer this question satisfactorily would be to enter into an elaborate investigation into the origin and history of the various nations who have occupied the extensive territories in which not only a great portion of the radical words of the Aryan tongue itself has been found, constituting, as those words do, the languages of the principal existing nations of Europe and Asia, but vestiges of a religion, mythological system, and institutions, which must at some former period, it may be legitimately induced, have prevailed in these countries, but which have been considerably modified in the course of ages by subsequent historical events. In the present state of our knowledge, when the great bulk of ancient Sanskrit literature (with the exception of the small portion which has already appeared in print) remains still in manuscript, unread, untranslated, unknown, and difficult of access, such an attempt is impossible.

All that can be done, until more data are afforded by the examination of the works which are still imperfectly known to us, is to present a few cursory and general observations only, on some facts connected with the history of this people. It is only since their language has been studied in Europe by a few scholars, and a portion of its literature become known, that the latter are in a position to form, perhaps, a more correct notion of the source whence the early civilization of the Hellenic states, of the nations of Italy, of the Germanic tribes, of the Celts of Spain, Gaul, Britain, in short of all the peoples whose languages can be traced to Sanskrit, has been derived.

If it be asked upon what ground is such a conclusion founded, I reply—upon the fact, already anticipated, that all the languages of the Aryan family, and consequently all their dialects, subdialects, and varieties, have been framed from a Sanskrit basis, and are only modified and corrupted forms of what was once the original tongue of the Aryan race of India.

From the preceding premises, however meagre and incomplete in some respects, yet sufficient, perhaps, for the present purpose, I am disposed to draw the two following general conclusions:

First, that all the above nations, whose ethnical speech can be shown from comparative philology to be derived from Sanskrit, have sprung from the migrations and dispersion of the ancient Aryan race of India, effected in the course of ages (whether originally with a view to establish colonies or otherwise is immaterial), through causes which

are in constant operation in the histories of all races ancient and modern; such as religious schisms, political dissensions, and civil wars, the consequence of which, with reference to the Aryans, was the expulsion from India of the defeated parties, and their founding various states in the countries into which they migrated, principally in a westerly direction.

Or, secondly, that the Aryans, at a period as yet undetermined, advanced towards and invaded the countries to the west and north-west of India, conquered the various tribes who occupied the land, who must have been in every respect, in arts, arms, and civilization, inferior to themselves and easily reduced to subjection. On these they must have imposed their religion, institutions, and language, which latter appears to have obliterated nearly all traces of the former non-Aryan language, or languages, of the conquered tribes. I conceive this to have been effected in a manner analogous to the conquests, in more recent times, of the Romans, and the dissemination of the Latin tongue, in Gaul, Spain, and other regions subjugated by the Romans.

Of these two conclusions I am of opinion that the latter has the greater probability in its favour; for it is scarcely possible that the Aryans, in their progress to the west, should have passed territories entirely uninhabited. All the regions they traversed must have been occupied by some variety or other of the human species; whether aboriginal tribes of whom nothing is now known, or races connected either with the Chinese of the extreme east of Asia, or the so-called Semitic race of the extreme west of the same continent. There does not appear, however, to have been any great nation in central or western Asia capable of resisting their advance, as no traces of any such nation, no vestiges of a non-Aryan tongue, exclusive of the mixed Chino-Tatar dialects and Semitic languages, have been met with. The Finnish, Turkish, Tungusian, Mongolian, and other races, were either not encountered by the Aryans, or not in existence at that early period. All these appear to be of comparatively recent origin, and to have sprung up in central and northern Asia subsequently to the passage of the Aryans and their mixed descendants, the Indo-Scythians and other kindred branches, into Europe, which may be aptly considered as, physico-geographically, only the great north-western peninsula of Asia.¹

¹ This view is confirmed by Schott, in the *Abhandlungen der königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, for 1849, p. 353, who has remarked that in the languages of the Turkish and Finnish tribes of Central Asia many terms which were supposed to be of pure Tatar origin are traceable to Sanskrit. He

Several well established historical events, which have happened in succeeding times, may be cited in support of the view I take of the spread of the Aryan tongue, based, as it is, on a law inherent in human nature, and prevailing in the histories of all nations—the imposition of the language and institutions of the conquering race on the people conquered. Thus the irruption of the Anglo-Saxons into Britain, in the fifth century, forced the Celtic language of the inhabitants to recede before the Anglo-Saxon, which, six centuries later, yielded in its turn to the effects of the Norman invasion, in the production of English in its different forms. A stronger analogy exists in the conquests of the Arabs, in the seventh and eighth centuries, and the spread of their language over Syria, Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Persia, and Afghanistan, to the confines of India and Chinese Tartary on the east; and Egypt, Nubia, central and northern Africa, to Spain and Portugal in the west.

But the strongest analogy, perhaps, which can be adduced for the extension of the Sanskrit language and Aryan civilization over Asia and Europe is the extension of the English language and civilization over a great portion of the continent of North America, which is actually taking place, and which, familiar as it is, has its prototype in the migrations, conquests, and settlement of the ancient Aryans in Western Asia and Europe. It is only the repetition of an historical fact, accomplished long ages past by our predecessors.

There are no data to enable us to judge whether the local tribes the Aryans may have met with occupying the intermediate regions, were, with the exception of the nations of Semitic origin, in a state of civilization more advanced than that of the red men of America, whom the English colonists encountered, and expelled from the lands they originally possessed.

To illustrate the analogy drawn from Roman history by a simple parallel :—

instances the Sanskrit अक्षि (eye) and अद् (eat) as constituting the roots of numerous words in the languages of those tribes, the same as in the Indo-European family of languages. Since the period of the first extension of the Aryan tongue in a westerly direction from India, a considerable number of various languages have been disseminated by the Chino-Tatar nations over central and northern Asia and northern and eastern Europe, in the languages of the Huns and their descendants; of the Finns, pure and mixed, Slavonic and Germanic; of the Tungusians, comprising the Manchu and its mixed Chinese dialects; of the Mongols, and its varieties, of which the Kalmak is the principal; of the Turki tribes, comprehending the Wighur, Chaghatai, or Jaghatai, Kipchak, Usmání and other dialects.

The universal dominion of the Romans around the basin of the Mediterranean, comprehending the conquest of Italy, Gaul, and Spain, is an historical event sufficiently familiar to all. To this event is generally attributed the rise and formation of the Italian, French, and Spanish languages (without dwelling on other dialects of minor importance) viewed as independent national forms of speech, and the fact of their containing more than three-fourths of Latin words, which were diffused over these countries after their subjugation by the people who spoke the Roman language. Let us suppose that at the dismemberment of the Roman empire in the fifth century, amidst the general wreck consequent upon the irruption and ravages of the tribes designated as barbarians—more correctly on the invasions and conquests (effected from the same motives and with the same views as those of the Romans themselves) of the Gothic nations—the Latin tongue and literature had been entirely lost. Let us suppose that, after the lapse of a thousand years, the language should have been studied and recovered; that some of the best works in theology, metaphysics, law, history, the drama and lyric poetry, should have been read, and the structure of the language fully understood; that, combined with a general resemblance in the number of radical words and grammatical forms found to exist between the restored tongue and the modern dialects, other analogies should have been observed in the laws and institutions of the ancient and modern nations—analogies too striking to have been produced by a mere fortuitous coincidence. In such a case, without pursuing the parallel further, some might question, perhaps, the justness of any conclusion drawn from such analogies, but others would at once perceive their high importance to the successful investigation of the causes which have produced them. These causes are obviously the conquests and settlement of the Romans in the countries in which the modern languages I have named have been formed. They have sprung from Latin, exactly as the nations who speak them have received their culture and civilization from Latin sources.

In further elucidation of the subject by a still closer parallel, drawn from our own historical connection with North America, let us imagine that at some remote future period (for it is just as legitimate to cast a glance at *probable future* events as to review *probable past* events in history), owing to the constant vicissitudes to which the relations of all nations are subject, from the ravages of wars, the destruction of records, the rise and spread of new religious schisms, or the gradual changes effected in national manners, habits, and opinions, by time alone, doubts should be entertained as to the true origin of the people (supposing the present race to continue), who will occupy the territories which

now constitute those of the United States of America. Though the language which the Anglo-Americans now speak will have undergone various alterations, and will exhibit an aspect altogether different from that which it bears at the present time, from the introduction and adoption of new words, the obsolescence or extinction of others, and the modification of all conditions, more or less, in the forms of speech, yet a sufficient number of radical words will remain, the genuine English physiognomy of which will enable any future investigator to determine, by means of this fundamental stock, combined with collateral analogies in laws and institutions, the connection which must have necessarily existed between the people of the United States and the English in past times—to infer, in short, that the language and civilization of the more recent had been derived, if they themselves were not descended, from the more ancient race.

This result will be attained independently of the consideration that the red races of America, and their languages, are rapidly tending to extinction. Their present condition does not differ much from that of the aboriginal tribes of Europe, who, with one or two exceptions, perhaps, appear to have become analogously extinct several centuries anterior to the Christian era, on the rise, growth, and spread of the Aryan nations over Europe.

The causes which have produced these phenomena in a comparatively recent period of universal history, must have antecedently existed to have produced similar effects in earlier times.

Such is the position of the Indo-European family, that is to say, of the Persians, Armenians, and other less important subdivisions of the same race, in Asia Minor; of the Hellenic tribes of the south of Europe and proximate islands; of the nations of Italy, of the Goths, Germans, Celts, and of all who speak languages derived from the Sanskrit—such is their position with reference to the Aryans and their immediate descendants, who at some remote period, to which European historical records do not reach, appear to have migrated into regions where it would be impossible that such remains as now exist of their primitive speech, in the fundamental portion of the existing languages of these recent nations, together with vestiges of institutions, &c., could be found without such a cause.

Whether the stream of migration stopped at intervening points between the original land of the Aryans and the west, resulting in the foundation of new states and principalities, agreeably to the first corollary, or whether the Aryans advanced more rapidly in their progress, spreading their language and religion over the countries into which they penetrated, though mixing little with the aboriginal tribes,

in accord with the second conclusion—the result is identical. Their language has been found existing, not merely in a fragmentary or isolated state, but well established, in the geographical tract above delineated, to the exclusion nearly of the languages of the other two distinct races, the Chinese and the Semitic—which are principally confined to the territories inhabited by either of these, or their descendants.¹

Nor is the extent of territory supposed to have been traversed in these migrations an objection to the hypothesis, since authentic history records the establishment of two empires fully as extensive as the limits here considered, to which the Sanskrit language has been spread; namely, the Roman empire, as we have seen, coeval with the extension of the Latin tongue, from the first to the fourth century of the Christian era; and the empire of the Khalifas, and expansion of the Arabic language, from the seventh to the tenth century. I might name, also, as to extent, the empire of the Mongols, under Changiz Khán and his descendants; and, a century and a half later, that of Tímúr Lang, which reached from the confines of China to Moskow. The area of the present Russian empire is still more vast. Yet these regions have been overrun, and great empires founded in them by conquerors, after the most sanguinary conflicts, in less time, perhaps, than the Aryans took to reach western Asia and Europe.

Are there grounds then to infer historically that the Aryans, after establishing themselves in Persia and Asia Minor, reached Europe and spread themselves over to Greece and Italy? Are there grounds to infer that they subsequently founded different principalities in various parts of Europe, introducing their language, religion, and institutions? Are there grounds to infer that these principalities, after having been subjected to the usual vicissitudes observed to exist in all human institutions, gradually disappeared, from the same causes which are seen in operation in the more recent histories of other nations? Are there grounds to infer that, after the rise, progress, extension, wars, internal dissensions, and final subversion of these states, concomitant with the extinction of dynasties of princes and the dispersion of the people, whose language, however, has still *survived* in the existing dialects of their modern successors, an age of darkness analogous to what has

¹ This observation does not apply to the changes which have been effected in various languages of Asia from the spread of Islám in some regions, and of Buddhism in others, which has taken place at subsequent epochs, from which numerous Arabic words have been introduced into all the Muhammado-Aryan and Turkish languages, and Sanskrit words into the Tibetan, the Chino-Tatar dialects, and Chinese itself.

been designated as the darkness of the middle ages, consequent on the subversion of the Roman empire followed, during which ante-hellenic period all historical records must have perished? Are we justified in concluding that some such analogous interval of darkness must have taken place—in the course of which the Aryans appear to have been gradually blended with the local races, with the certainty, however, that they very considerably predominated in numbers and in ethnical constitution, to account for the remarkable physiognomy in language, institutions, &c., which they have transmitted to their successors—are we justified in deducing the existence of this state of things in Europe, until the epoch when the Hellenic nations, and, synchronously with these, different tribes of Italy and Sicily, began to form themselves into new communities and states, to enter, in their turn, into a new career of national existence, and to play their part on the great stage of universal history? In the absence of more positive data, to be obtained from comparative history and further research, I am of opinion that there are grounds to answer these questions generally in the affirmative; but it is the future historian of the Aryan race, and their relations with ancient Europe, who will have to enter more fully into the difficulties connected with a comprehensive consideration of this subject, in order to be able to present a more satisfactory solution of these problems than can be, for the present, expected.

Of late years an opinion has been gaining an ascendancy that the Aryans are a people of an origin foreign to the soil of India, which they are presumed to have invaded and conquered, and to have imposed their religion and institutions on the so-called aborigines. Although this opinion is entertained by several distinguished men whose ideas on the question are entitled to great consideration, on examination, however, it appears to be founded on very insufficient data, and to be based on no fact of historical authenticity. The only thing of any importance connected with this hypothesis, and on which it seems to rest, is the circumstance that the languages and physical type of the scattered hill tribes of India have been found to differ from those of the Aryan Hindus, and to resemble those of some of the Tatar nations, according to a few authorities; or to those of the Chinese, according to others; or to those of the Tamulians, in conformity with the opinions of another class. But to assume that a few isolated semi-barbarous tribes, inconsiderable in numbers, some of whom live as outcasts of Hindu society in the forests, and others are of notorious predatory habits, who possess nothing in the shape of a collection of writings which constitute an original or cultivated literature, such as is the Sanskrit; who have no written records or laws, no system of religion transmitted from

ancient times by even oral tradition ; no well-defined institutions, and who can give, in short, no satisfactory account of themselves—to assume that such tribes are the aborigines of India, or that they are more ancient than the early civilized Aryan Hindus, is to maintain the reverse of what facts, based on the results of comparative philological researches, indicate.

If it be well established that the dialects of these people are analogous in original structure to any of the languages of the Tatar tribes—themselves, as we have seen, of comparatively recent origin—it is possible they may be descended from some of the barbaric hordes, who, under various denominations, such as the 'Sakas, Hūnas, &c., are mentioned by Sanskrit writers as having invaded India at different periods. These irruptions, which took place during the decline of the political power of the Hindu princes of Western India, though sometimes successful, must have terminated more generally in the defeat and dispersion of the invaders, and in their taking refuge in the hills and forests. The event has subsequently given rise, perhaps, to the formation of those isolated tribes who have been mistaken for aborigines. It is possible also that they may be mixed descendants of the Tamulians and the low castes of the Hindus themselves.

The opinion to which I allude, however, may have originated from another source, and seems to be the consequence of an erroneous inference drawn from a misapprehension of the subject of the ancient historical poem of the Rāmāyana. Every Sanscritist knows that the principal subject of this poem is the war between Rāma, the son of Daśaratha, king of Ayodhyā, one of the most ancient cities of India, who at that period was the most powerful prince of the Aryans in the north, and Rāvaṇa, a powerful prince reigning over the southern portion of the peninsula and Ceylon. Whether Rāvaṇa, divested of his preternatural character of a rākshas, conferred on him by poetical license, and subjected to an impartial historical examination, is to be interpreted as an Aryan prince, and in that case the war between him and Rāma was a civil war ; or whether he is to be regarded as the chief of a race ethnically distinct from the Aryans and ruling over a portion of southern India and Ceylon, whose sway possibly reached to Sumatra, Java, and the coast of Malacca, does not properly fall within the scope of this limited paper to consider. I think the latter hypothesis has the greater historical probability.

Is it legitimate, however, to infer that because the Aryans early spread to the south, as they did to the west and north-west, whether under Rāma or prior to him is immaterial, and extended themselves over the peninsula, they also originally invaded, from some unknown

region, and conquered India itself? If so, the same argument might be applied to the origin and spread of the Romans, who might be presumed to have invaded Italy from some external unknown region, because they early spread their conquests to the south, as they did in other directions, and subjugated the tribes of that part of Italy and Sicily.¹ But we know from authentic history that the Romans arose from one city and region of Italy : that, by the peculiar social organization, energy of character, national genius, and union, which distinguished them for several centuries, they gradually extended themselves over and subjugated those territories which subsequently formed one vast empire. Though the sources of our information with reference to the Aryan race, which must be principally derived from Sanskrit literature, are, as yet less known than those afforded by classical literature for the elucidation of various questions relating to early Rome, yet by a close comparison of facts and the observance of striking analogies in the universal history of different nations—analogies developed from the unity and homogeneity of the laws which govern the progress of the human race—an approximation may be attained, I think, to the solution of the problem of the spread and expansion of the people and the language under consideration.

The above notion, moreover, may have arisen from the vague sense attached by ourselves to the ethnic term "India," which has been applied to territories which, in the early history of the race, did not belong, strictly speaking, to *Āryā-varṭta*, the land of the ancient Aryans, that is to say, to India-*Proper*, the land of the true Indians. Without referring to a variety of authorities, such as the *Rāmāyana*, the *Bhārata*, the *Vishṇu*, *Bhāgavata*, and other *Purāṇas*, which have incidentally alluded to the subject, a few passages from the second chapter of the "Dharma-śāstra of Manu," relative to the early seat of the Hindus, though well known to Orientalists, with the inferences to which they lead, will place the question, perhaps, in a clearer point of view. In śloka seventeen we read :

सरस्वतीदृषद्वत्योर्देवनद्योर्दन्तरम् ।

तन्देवनिर्मितन्देगमन्ब्रह्मावर्त्तमचक्षते ॥

"That which is between the *Saraswatī* and the *Drishadwat*, rivers of the gods, that country, laid out (*nirmita*) by the gods, is called *Brahmā-varṭta*."

¹ It would be quite as legitimate to maintain that the Arabs were immigrants and foreigners in Arabia, the Chinese in China, or the Hellenic nations in Greece, as to maintain that the Aryans were immigrants or foreigners in *Āryā-varṭta*.

Brahmá-varṭta, at a more recent period of the development of the Hindu religious mind, might have designated the region of the Himá-laya where religious austerities and mortifications were performed. But viewed as the seat of the incipient civilization of the Hindus, its occupation may be considered as the first era in their history. It is generally very briefly alluded to in the Puráṇas and by all Sanskrit writers. Their connection with this region seems to relate to the period of their first well recognized establishment in social communities and political organization—the infancy of their nation. Here I may remark that the first epoch of the rise and appearance of every people is always obscure and difficult of investigation. This applies, with very few exceptions, to the true historical foundation of many *modern* as well as ancient states.

As the Aryans increased in numbers, and advanced in the knowledge of the arts necessary to social progress and civilization, they began to extend themselves in various directions, and must have early peopled the fertile valleys watered by the Ganges, the Jamná, and other streams which fall into these rivers. We find them next in occupation of the region thus defined in śloka 21 :

हिमवद्विन्ध्ययोर्मध्यम्प्राग्निशनादपि ।

प्रत्यगेवप्रयागाच्चमध्यदेशः प्रकीर्तितः ॥

“That which lies midway between Himavatl and Vindhya, to the east of Vinasá, to the west of Prayága, is celebrated as Madhya-deśa.”

This is the territory extending, as is sufficiently intelligible, from the lower range of the Himálaya on the north-east to the Vindhya chain on the west. In these regions, so highly favoured by nature for the growth and support of a rising nation, the Aryans early founded the well known cities of Ayodhyá, Prayága, and Benares, which are still flourishing ; and several other cities, the ruins of some of which only now remain, whilst others have left no vestiges but their names. The occupation of Madhya-deśa by the Aryans may be regarded as the second era in their history.

At a subsequent epoch, though still remote in reference to the political foundation of the most ancient of our western nations, whose antiquity is comparatively of recent date in universal history—at the epoch of the composition of the súktas, or hymns, of the Vedas, the Aryans were already settled in the extensive tract of country reaching from Kuru, or more definitely the Panjáb, in the north-west, to the bay of Bengal in the south-east, the Indian Ocean to the south-west, and had

progressed considerably to the south. In several passages of the Rig-veda, "the oldest extant records of the ancient world," allusion is familiarly made to the ocean, to ships, merchants, chariots, the mechanical arts, and other accompaniments of a civilization *already established*. Indeed the very circumstance of the composition of the sūktas of the Vedas in the measured language of poetry, argues a previous state of national existence, during which interval the learned—the Brahmans—must have been engaged for no inconsiderable period in cultivating, improving, and polishing their language, so as to adapt it, in conformity with the requirements of their primitive religion, and the belief then prevailing in India, to be the medium of offering praise or solicitation to the deities in the hymns, or conveying religious instruction to the people in the more expanded form of the brāhmanas, or sūtras. The Aryan tongue had already attained the first degree of *sanskritism*, if I may so express myself, that is to say, of metrical refinement and precision sufficient for the purpose then desired. This is the territory described in the following śloka :

आसमुद्रात्तुवैपूर्वादासमुद्रात्तुपश्चिमात् ।
तयोरेवान्तरंगिर्यौरार्यावर्त्तविदुर्बुधाः ॥

"As far as the sea to the east, and the sea to the west, between those two mountains, lies the country which the intelligent know as Āryā-varṭta."² Manu II. 22.

In the age in which the code of Manu was compiled, Āryā-varṭta—of which Brahmā-varṭta was in succeeding times contemplated as a sort of "holy land," and Madhya-deśa a considerable district—popularly designated the country of the Aryans, and constituted, as before intimated what may be considered as *India-Proprie*, in contradistinction to the Dakṣiṇ, or country to the south in the peninsula, which originally and properly understood, did not form a part of Āryā-varṭta, or

¹ Wilson, Translation of the Rig-veda, Introd., p. 40.

² The expression **स्त्रेच्छदेशस्वतः परः** "the land of the barbarians is altogether different," which occurs at the end of the next śloka, would scarcely have occurred to any one speaking of a region which had been acquired by his countrymen by invasion and subjugation; when, had such an event really happened, or had any tradition of such an event existed, it is more probable that the circumstance would have been mentioned with some degree of national pride, or been alluded to in some manner or other. No such tradition is to be found throughout the whole extent of Sanskrit literature, ancient or modern.

India-*Proper*.¹ It was subsequently to their extension over this territory and its occupation, which may be regarded as the third era in their history, when the Aryans had attained an advanced state of civilization, when the Vedas had been composed, and a national system of religion established; when the Brahmanical hierarchy had been formed, the Aryan tongue cultivated, and codes of law compiled; when tribes had separated under particular princes, and founded different governments in various parts of the country; when religious schisms had begun to arise, anti-Brahmanical sects had increased, political dissensions and civil war had spread their effects—that the migrations in a westerly and north-westerly direction, which terminated in the extension of the Aryan tongue over the geographical zone I have pointed out, took place.

It is the race of the peninsula who may be more broadly contrasted with the Aryans than the rude hill-tribes. The early inhabitants of the Dakkhin appear to have been a people distinct by race and language from the Aryans. Their descendants, however much blended with the latter and with other nations, are obviously the southern people whose natural speech is the Tamul, or the dialects based upon this tongue, which are now more or less mixed with the Sanskrit. They appear to have formed an empire in the south of India and in the contiguous islands, to which I have already alluded; over these the prince designated Rāvaṇa by the Sanskrit writers, seems to have reigned contemporaneously with Rāma, and to have sustained a protracted war with him, with alternate success, until his final overthrow and death. After this event it might be presumed that the whole of the peninsula was subjugated by the Aryans, and the Vaidik religion introduced. Of this southern empire, however, considered as representing an independent nationality, no records from purely Tamulian sources are extant. Nothing definite is known of it anterior to the Aryan connection. It is from Sanskrit sources that it may, I think, be inferred.

Although the existence of a non-Aryan people and nationality in the south are attested by the Tamulian race and language, the traditions of the Tamulians do not reach that period of their history which should relate to themselves as a people distinct from the Aryans in

¹ **आर्यावर्त्त** (*Āryā-varṭta*) employed as the name of India, not in its strictly etymological sense, differs very little in signification from the modern Persian **هندوستان** (*Hindūstān*), except being more limited in its application, first used by the Muhammadans when speaking of the same country, and which we still retain.

religion, laws, and institutions. They have never known themselves otherwise than as Hindus. The loss of this recollection points to a remote antiquity as the probable period of that conquest, though this event—the subjugation of the peninsula considered as having been previously occupied by a *mlechha* or barbarian people—is not recognized as such by any Sanskrit authority.

The Tamulians may have been rising as a distinct people and forming social communities, or states, in the south of India, coevally with the Aryans in the north. But there is nothing to indicate that the Tamulians, the hill-tribes, or any other recognised indigenous race, were ever in possession of *Āryā-varṭta* anterior to the Aryans. Under the supposition of the synchronous existence of the Tamulians it might be expected that, after a certain interval of time, they had attained, under similar circumstances, to an equal degree of civilization with the Aryans, before they came in contact with the latter. What literary or other monuments, of purely Tamulian or non-Aryan origin, have they to show that they ever reached this advanced state? If we turn to the Tamul language, the existence of which alone determines the question of a separate race, we ought to find a literature, or at least the remains of one, embodying some record of a religion, laws, and institutions entirely different from Hinduism, and altogether independent of Sanskrit. Instead of which, however, we find that every work in Tamul, as well as in Telugu, Canarese, and other cognate dialects, whether on grammar, law, medicine, religious or poetical subjects, bears the stamp of a comparatively modern Hinduism. There is nothing in the shape of a record of the Tamul mind which can recall to us anything independent of an obvious Sanskrit origin.

It may be said that the Hindus have destroyed all traces of a former ante-Aryan Tamulian civilization. This, however, is scarcely possible, if the people were at all numerous, which they would be after being established a few centuries, and if they were in any degree advanced in the arts. Some relic of a previously independent national existence would have been left. The memorials of the Mackenzie collection, amassed in Southern India, whether manuscripts, coins, medals, or statues, are all well-defined Hindu remains. Such is not the case, however, in reference to a younger branch of the Aryan family, further to the west, as evinced in the history of Persia. The Cuneiform and Pehlavi inscriptions, as well as the *Vandidad Sādah*, attest to the pre-existence of a people in Persia, who were conquered and expelled from their country by a race far more cruel and fanatical than the Aryans ever were, and who destroyed, in many instances, every vestige of the religion, laws, and institutions of the nations they

subjugated. Yet the Pársis and the Zandic literary remains are sufficient evidence of the former state of Persia, independently of further proof from western sources.

It is possible, however, that the Tamulian race may have originally immigrated into the peninsula from Ceylon, or the opposite coast of the bay of Bengal, at a period, though sufficiently remote, subsequent to the settlement of the Aryans all over southern India. Although this hypothesis is far from being well supported, it is not altogether unfounded, from the circumstance that the physical type of the genuine Tamulians and the Malays, as well as their languages, divested of the Sanskrit terms which pervade both Tamul and the Kawi tongues, appear to present analogies of a common ethnic character.

Assuming the Aryans to have been immigrants in India, according to the opinion to which I have adverted, let us inquire from what quarter they are likely to have entered India. Firstly, could they have penetrated from the west? From an examination of the structure of the Cuneiform-Persic, and Zandic, the oldest forms of the dialects of ancient Persia, it is evident that both have been derived from the Sanskrit; the relation which they bear to the latter being analogous to the relation of the Páli or Prákrit to the same—of Italian or Spanish to Latin. This relation, with respect to the Zandic, is confirmed by detached and fragmentary allusions in the ritual of the Yasna, or Vandidad Sádah, to well-known personages mentioned in the Vedas and Puráṇas, to Hindu deities and ancient heroes, allusions verified by the use of expressions which are only modified Zandic representatives of their original Sanskrit, such as *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌* (hufedra), or *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬵* (hufedhra, for *सुभद्र* (subhadra), “the auspicious,” a title of Vishnu; *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬌* (verothragna), and its synonymo *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬵*¹ (verethra-zan), for *वृत्रघ्न* (vr̥traghna) and *वृत्रहन्* (vr̥trahan), “slayer of Vritra; epithets of Indra; *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬵*² (harakaiti), for *सरस्वती* (Saraswatī), considered either as the river, or in the Pauranic sense of the bride of Brahmā and goddess of eloquence; and numerous other expressions of a similar character which occur in the Yasna; thus proving that the ancient Persians derived both the names of the personages mentioned in their scriptures and their language itself from the Aryans, and were themselves

¹ Bopp, Comp. Gram. Trans. s. 36, p. 33; and Burnouf, Commentaire sur le Yasna, p. 190.

² Burnouf, id., notes, pp. xci. xcii.

no other than the descendants of a branch of the latter people who had seceded from their brethren, and migrated to the west, or been expelled from their native country from the effects of religious dissensions resulting in civil war.

Secondly ; did the Aryans enter India from the north or north-west ? History does not record the existence of any civilized people, nor are there means of ascertaining by comparative philological research, or a reference to monuments, the existence of any such nation at this early period, with a language and religious system similar to those of the Aryans, from whom they might have been descended, who could have entered India ; for the different tribes vaguely denominated Scythians by the Greek historians, or Turanians by Firdausi and the Persian historians, appeared several ages later in central Asia. These tribes have been shown by several authorities to be ethnically related to the Scolotes, Sacæ, Alani, Getæ, Massagetæ, Goths, and Yueti of the Chinese.¹ The Getæ, by a still more recent autho-

¹ Compare Procopius, *De Bello Gothorum*, libb. II. and III. ; and Alex. von Humboldt, *Asie Centrale*, I. p. 400, and II. p. 252. A passage occurs in Ahmad bin Arabsháh's history of Tímúr, in which the Getæ are mentioned as occupying, so late as the fifteenth century, a territory contiguous to Mongol and Chinese Tatory, which that conqueror had reduced to subjection. The following is the passage :—

وَمَا وَصَلَ إِلَيَّ سَمَرْقَنْدَ أَرْسَلَ ابْنُ ابْنِهِ مُحَمَّدٌ سَلْطَانُ بْنُ جِهَانَكِيرٍ
مَعَ سَيْفِ الدِّينِ الْأَمِيرِ إِلَيَّ أَقْصَى مَا تَبَلَّغَ إِلَيْهِ مَمْلَكَتُهُ وَتَنَقَّذَ فِيهِ
كَلِمَتُهُ وَهُوَ رَأَى سَيَّحُونَ شَرْقًا سَوَا آخِذٌ فِي بَحْوَ مَمَالِكِ الْمَغْلِ وَ
الْجَتَا وَالْخَطَا نَحْوًا مِنْ مَسِيرَةِ شَهْرٍ عَنْ مَمَالِكِ مَاوَرَاءَ النَّهْرِ (كِتَابُ

عجایب المقدور فی اخبار تیمور (p. 70, Ed. of Calcutta, 1810)

“ When he [Tímúr] arrived at Samarkand, he sent his grandson, Muhammad Sultan, the son of Jahángír, with the Amír Seifuddín, to the furthest limit of his empire to which his authority reached, which was beyond the Jaxartes eastward, extending to the seas bordering on the territories of the Mongols, the Jatá [or Gatá, as the Arabs pronounce it], and Chinese Tatory (الخطا), about a month's journey from the country of Transoxania (Máwará an nahr).”

There seems scarcely room to doubt that the جتا here mentioned (who are noticed in two or three other places by Arabsháh, but very briefly) are the

rity,¹ have been identified with the Goths, and belong consequently to the Indo-Gothic branch of the Aryan race—descended, like the preceding, from the Aryans themselves.

Thirdly ; did the Aryans migrate from the east ? The only people who could have penetrated into India from this quarter are the Chinese, who belong, I need scarcely remark, to a race entirely distinct in language, religion, laws, and manners from the Aryans, who have clearly no genealogical relations with them. I am of opinion, however, that the Aryans, in their early warlike expeditions, were soon encountered by the Chinese eastward, already well established in a united monarchy, and arrested in their attempt to extend their power in this direction. It is a mistake to suppose from the mild and timid character of some of the modern Hindus that their ancestors at this period were like themselves. Several hymns of the Rig-veda, as well as the general tenor of the historical passages of the Rāmāyana and the Mahā-bhārata, breathe a martial spirit, which must have often determined the early Hindus to undertake distant expeditions. This national character agrees with what is observed of other nations at corresponding periods of their early histories. There are indications of the limits of the Chinese monarchy having extended to the borders of Bengal ; but this was at a subsequent period, when Buddhism was predominant in India, and when it had been introduced into China from India.

Fourthly ; did the Aryans originally issue from the table-land of Tibet in the north-east ? Independently of the physical barrier of the great chain of the Himalāya, which appears to have been one of the causes which determined the westerly and north-westerly direction of the Aryan migrations, the same ethnical objection applies to this hypothesis as to that of their Chinese origin. If they were ever in possession of this region, the Aryan element in the Tibetan physical organization has been erased by that of the Chinese race.

Fifthly ; could they have emigrated from any quarter originally inhabited by the Phenicio-Arabian or Semitic race ? Under this supposition words of an undoubted Semitic origin would long since have been found in Sanskrit. But the structure of the latter and

descendants of a branch of the Getæ, of whom there were several tribes, whom conquests or political events had impelled to the east, whilst other tribes, from similar causes, had proceeded in an opposite direction. They are alluded to in some Chinese historical works, and are described as being of fair complexion, with blue eyes and light hair. The Getæ are not named in the Behistun Inscription among the nations who were subjected to the rule of Darius.

¹ Jacob Grimm, Ueber Jornandes, 1846, s. 21.

its total dissimilarity to any Semitic dialect are fatal to such a conjecture.¹

Finally; are the Aryans to be traced to an Egyptian origin? Notwithstanding that Jones, Wilford, Bohlen, and other orientalists,

¹ Sanskrit terms, on the contrary, have penetrated into the Semitic languages, as has been shown by Lassen, Gesenius, and others, in the names of a variety of objects which evince the existence, at the period to which they relate, of a remarkable commercial intercourse between the countries inhabited by the Phœnicio-Arabian nations and India. Beside the Arabic ^{قزدير} *kazdir* (Greek *κασσιτερος*, Latin *Cassiterides*, applied to the Scilly Isles and to a part of Cornwall, from tin being found there), Sanskrit ^{कस्तीर} *kastīra*, "tin;" Arabic ^{سكر} *sukkar* (Greek *σάκχαρ* and *σάκχαρον*, Latin *saccharum*), Sanskrit ^{शर्करा} *sarkarā*, in the modified sense of "sugar;" Arabic ^{صندل} *sandal* (Greek *σάνταλον*, Latin *santalum*), Sanskrit ^{चन्दन} *chandana*, "sandal-wood;" Arabic ^{ارز} *uruz* (Greek *ὄρυζα*, Latin *oryza*), though more changed in form, yet easily recognised, Sanskrit ^{व्रीहि} *vrīhi*, "rice;" Arabic ^{ايس} *ais*, in the sense of "existence," Sanskrit ^{अस} *as*, "to be;" and numerous other words which cannot be here noticed at length; if the Hebrew ^{תוכים} *tukkiim* (1 Kings, x. 22) be correctly translated by "peacocks," it is derived from the Sanskrit ^{शिखिन्} *sikhin*. If it mean a parrot, however, as Quatremère interprets the word, it corresponds equally as closely to the Sanskrit ^{शुक} *suka*, with the change of the sibilant for the dental, as in *θάλαττα* for *θάλασσα*, and with the Hebrew plural termination ^{ים} *im*. ^{קופים} *kophim* is, with little variation, the Sanskrit ^{कपि} *kapi*, "ape," also with the plural ending ^{ים}. ^{נרד} *nard* is the Sanskrit ^{नलद} *nalada*, "spikenard," with the common permutation of the liquids, as is shown also in *νάμδος*. In the latter part of the expression ^{שנהבים} *sen habim*, literally "tooth of elephants," is recognised the Sanskrit ^{इभ} *ibha*, "elephant;" which, in combination with another element (the Arabic ^{ال} *al*, according to Gesenius and Benary), has probably produced the Greek *ἐλέφας*.

These etymologies become verified when we consider that the country from which these animals and objects were exported, and introduced into Palestine by Phœnician or Arab merchants, was no other than India, in which they all abound. The country itself is thus identified, both by its natural products and their Sanskrit names.

from certain remarkable analogies in institutions and manners between them, conjectured that the ancient Egyptians and Indians were a people of a common origin, in contradistinction to the Hebrews, Phœnicians, Arabs, and the Chino-Tatar race, yet from the researches of Champollion, Lepsius, Bunsen, and other Egyptologists, in deciphering the hieroglyphics, and fixing phonetic values to the symbols ascertained to be of alphabetical character, it would appear that the language of that ancient people, judged from those results, belongs rather to the Semitic family, which would seem to separate them at once from a community of origin with the Aryans, thus rendering the descent of the latter from the former highly improbable.¹

¹ The efforts which have been made to fix definite phonetic values to some of the hieroglyphical symbols, and to ascertain the nature of the alphabetical letters which those symbols probably represented, have been principally confined to monuments of the New Empire, which exist more numerous than those of the Old Monarchy, when the Egyptian language had undergone a most important change. This modified language may have been the parent of the modern Coptic, although the latter is itself disguised in the vesture of the Greek alphabet, and contains words of apparent Tatarian and Finnish origin. (See Schott, in the *Abhandlungen der Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, for 1849, pp. 320, 321.) The radical words of this Coptic are supposed by some authorities to constitute the remains of the ancient Egyptian language, and have been employed as the basis of an investigation into the phonetic nature of the hieroglyphical symbols.

The invasion of the Hyksos, however, and duration of their sway in Lower Egypt, which intervened between the flourishing periods of the old and the later Egyptian monarchies, produced a result which has since only been repeated in a variety of instances in the histories of other nations. The Semitic element in the language of the Egyptians, I think, was received *after the conquest of Lower Egypt by the Hyksos*, and must have incorporated itself with what I am disposed to consider was the *ancient Aryan basis* of the Egyptian tongue of the *Old Empire*, and produced the *Neo-Egyptian* of the monuments of the *New Empire*, in a mode similar, as I have already observed, to the formation of numerous modern languages, such as the Persian, after the Arab conquest, or the Hindustani, posterior to the Muhammedan subjugation of India.

Notwithstanding all that has been written and said on the origin of Egyptian and Indian civilization, from the time of Sir William Jones to our own days, I venture to entertain the opinion that the researches of the interpreters of the hieroglyphics will soon establish what I have long considered as next to certain, that the Menes of the Egyptians, and Manu (anciently Manus) of the Hindus refer to an historical personage—an Aryan chief—who first invaded and conquered Egypt from India; and I think this event is the earliest well-defined instance of the migrations of the Aryans westward which I have above noticed. That Egyptian civilization was not originally indigenous in Egypt can be deduced from several circumstances. The Egyptians were always an isolated people in Africa; their contiguous neighbours of the west and south being all of a race—the Negro, the true aboriginal race of that continent—entirely different from themselves. Egypt, on the invasion of Menes, appears to have been inhabited by the Negro

It appears, then, that most of these nations are of more recent political establishment, or national existence, than the Aryans.

From these considerations it follows that there is not sufficient foundation for the hypothesis that the ancient Aryans, Indians, or Hindus, entered India-*Proper* from some external region. On the contrary, the facts above delineated point to the conclusion that the rise, progress, advance in the arts, and civilization of this remarkable people, are the growth of their own land, developed during the course of long ages, and communicated to other nations sprung partly from themselves and partly from other primitive races whose true history is now entirely lost; nations who have transmitted this civilization,

race. The valley of the Nile was too restricted in extent to be the nursery of the various and powerful Aryan nations who have played so important a part in universal history. The Egyptians have but one Menes, who, they admit, was the founder of their empire. It is now ascertained from the monuments that this Menes was, with respect to Egypt itself, a foreign invader and conqueror. The Hindus have had, at least, seven personages of this name, whose memorials, as preserved in Sanskrit writers, are sufficiently satisfactory to relate to real actors whose history has accumulated round itself during the course of ages such a mass of fiction—the mythological creations of later periods—as to render it difficult (but not more so than in the records of other nations) to keep the historical basis of probability and truth steadily in view, and separate it from the imaginary portion; which, as in other instances, envelops too many otherwise natural and authentic historical facts.

The name of Rámas, or Ramasses, borne by several kings of Egypt, is certainly the Sanskrit रामम्—a genuine Hindu appellation; but these kings must

not be confounded with the three celebrated Rámas of the Hindus, any more than our own Henries with the Henries of France; nor must Menes be identified with the supposed author of the Institutes, but is a distinct personage, though bearing the same name, and of the same race as the Hindus themselves. My own opinion is, that the Egyptians were originally non-Vaidik Aryans and schismatics. Their schism from the established religious system of the latter took place long prior to the secession of Buddha from the same.

The Hyksos, after their expulsion from Egypt by Ramasses the Great, may have seized on Syria and Mesopotamia, and founded what has been considered as the Assyrian monarchy, if it be certain that this monarchy was not a dependency of the Persian, or rather Aryan, empire, which had been previously established and ruled by Aryan princes in Persia. Sir William Jones considered it identical with the Pishadáf dynasty of Persia. The founder of the Assyrian line of kings, in the genealogical list discovered by Rawlinson, appears, according to him, to have flourished about the fifteenth or sixteenth century before the Christian era. This period very nearly coincides with the epoch of the expulsion of the Hyksos from Egypt, and I think it possible that the foundation of that monarchy, supposing it to be of Semitic origin, or a change of dynasty in Assyria, may have been effected as a consequence of that event. For more positive information, however, we must wait for further results from the interpretation of both the hieroglyphics and the Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions.

modified from various causes, to other nations, and these again to more recent ones, until we attain the epoch, as I have already indicated, of the first appearance of the Hellenic and Italic tribes of the south of Europe. Every one acquainted with Sanskrit literature, moreover, must know that no traces whatever of an alien element, or foreign origin, can be discovered in the language, religion, laws, or institutions of the Aryans, throughout all the phases they must have necessarily passed in the course of time. Such a presumption would be refuted by the whole tenor of the Vaidik literature, of the ancient portion of the Purāṇas, of the codes of law from Manu downwards, of the great heroic poems, and even of Buddhistical Sanskrit writings. No monuments, no records, no tradition of the Aryans ever having originally occupied, as Aryans, any other seat, so far as can be ascertained to the present time, than the plains to the south-west of the Himalayan chain, bounded by the two seas defined by Manu,—monuments such as exist in the histories of other nations well known to have migrated from their primitive abodes,—can be found in India.

To pursue the various and complicated details of these interesting questions further, however, would be to anticipate what I may attempt to accomplish, perhaps, at a future period. My object being to represent historical facts in what I conceive to be their true light, I beg to close this essay with the observation that if any of the positions I have here advanced, bearing on the ancient history of the Indian race, in their connection with Europe, can be satisfactorily shown to be unfounded or erroneous, I shall cheerfully modify or renounce them, according to the degree, character, and extent of the evidence adduced to oppose them. Until it can be demonstrated that those positions are untenable, I may be permitted, perhaps, as an independent inquirer, to consider that, for the present, at least, they are well supported by such data as are available for researches of this nature.